

Remarks

In the non-final Office Action dated November 14, 2008, claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, 13-15, and 17-18 are pending and claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, 13-15, and 17-18 stand rejected. The Applicants traverse the rejections herein.

35 USC § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, 13-15, and 17-18 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No.: 7,079,264 (Nguyen) in further view of various combinations of US Patent No.: 7,079,277 (Fukazawa), US Patent No.: 5,526,477 (McConnell), and US Patent No.: 7,202,977 (Robinson). The Applicants submit that the references cited by the Examiner do not render claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, 13-15, and 17-18 obvious.

Claim 1 recites a printer for printing a Unicode data stream, where the datastream includes a section of Unicode complex text data. The printer includes a text parser adapted to parse the Unicode data stream to determine the section of Unicode complex text in the Unicode data stream. The printer further includes a layout engine coupled to the text parser and adapted to receive the section of Unicode complex text from the text parser and to determine at least one of a plurality of glyphs of at least one font corresponding to the section of Unicode complex text data. The printer further includes a rasterizer coupled to the layout engine and the text parser and adapted to perform processing on the section of Unicode complex text data based on the language encoded by the data to position the at least one of the plurality of glyphs on a portion of a page.

The Applicants submit that Robinson does not teach or reasonably suggest the limitation of "a rasterizer adapted to perform processing on the section of Unicode complex text data based on the language encoded by the data to position the at least one of the plurality of glyphs on a portion of a page" as recited in claim 1. Robinson discloses methods for positioning an image capture device to capture page identification markings on printed pages. Page identification markings (i.e., integrity markings) on printed pages are used to determine which pages have or have not been printed from a print job (Abstract; Background). FIG. 5 in Robinson illustrates various steps including creating an electronic document (S505), adding integrity marking data (S510), sending the document to a raster image processor (S515), determining a location of the

integrity marking data for each document (S520), and automatically adjusting the image capture device location based on the location of the integrity marking location information (S525). In presenting the rejection, the Examiner suggests that step S520 and column 5, lines 33-46 teach this limitation. The Applicants disagree. Step S520 discloses determining a location of the integrity markings within the PDL data so an image capture device position can be adjusted in order to capture the integrity marking on a page (Column 5, lines 33-34; S525). There is no teaching or suggestion in Robinson that the integrity markings are placed on the page based on a language encoded by the PDL data. Instead, Robinson discloses that the integrity markings are variably located "to facilitate the optimum placement of text on the given page" (Column 1, lines 42-44).

The Applicants further submit that this limitation is neither taught nor reasonably suggested by Nguyen, Fukazawa, or McConnell, and that claim 1 is non-obvious for at least these reasons. Similar arguments apply to independent claim 11. Dependent claims 3-6, 8-9, and 13-18 are non-obvious for at least depending on base claims 1 and 11.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, 13-15, and 17-18 are non-obvious for at least the reasons provided above. The Applicants thus respectfully ask the Examiner to allow claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, 13-15, and 17-18.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 17, 2009

/Sean J. Varley/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
Telephone: (303) 786-7687
Facsimile: (303) 786-7691
Customer No.: 50441